

## REMARKS

The objection to claim 50 is avoided since the claim is now cancelled.

The Examiner rejects claims 42, 53, 55, and 56 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Reihl in view of Frank further in view of Hansmann.

Claim 42 clearly distinguishes over Reihl at least by reciting recording quality data comprising at least one tolerance value range regarding the individual parts or part aggregates. This feature is found in Applicant's Substitute Specification at page 13, lines 17 and 18. For quality generally the Examiner relied on column 12, lines 3-4 indicating that the printer control checks whether the toner recipe is acceptable. Toner recipe is simply the type of toner contained in the bottles. But there is no tolerance value range for toner anywhere in this reference, and such data is never stored in Reihl. Only the type of toner is stored.

Claim 42 next distinguishes by reciting associating a transponder with each individual part or individual part aggregate and delivering them to an assembly production site where they are stored until they required for assembly. But in Reihl there is only one transponder for both the toner bottle and the toner inside the bottle. Thus this is an aggregate part having only one transponder. But there is never any assembly of a plurality of toner bottles with toner. And if the Examiner were to contend that the toner is one part and the bottle is another part, there are no individual transponder for the toner and another individual transponder for the bottle. Thus claim 42 readily distinguishes since there is no assembly of multiple part aggregates in Reihl where each part aggregate has a transponder.

Next claim 42 distinguishes at least by reciting before storage reading and checking the quality data at least one tolerance value range at a quality check station of the assembly production site and if the quality check yields that the delivered parts or part aggregates lie outside of the at least one tolerance range, rejection and return is automatically activated. This language is taken from Applicants' Substitute Specification at page 13, the paragraph beginning at line 12. This paragraph also defines quality data as tolerance values and discusses the tolerance ranges and if parts lie outside of the allowable tolerance ranges, rejection and return of the flawed delivery can be automatically activated.

The secondary reference of Frank was only cited for detecting removal of a part from a parts tray but there is no assembly of the parts in the parts tray and therefore for the reasons noted above in Reihl, Frank cannot suggest the assembly of parts aggregates where each part aggregate has a transponder. Also in Frank there is no disclosure of the quality being a tolerance range and checking the tolerance range before storage and returning the part or part aggregate if it is outside the tolerance range.

Hansmann was cited for payment and a checkout system and invoicing. But Hansmann does not satisfy the above deficiencies noted in Frank and Reihl. Clearly Hansmann has nothing to do with assembly of parts and there is no tolerance range checking.

Dependent claims 43-49 and 51-54 distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 42 and also by reciting additional features not suggested.

System claim 55 and computer-readable medium claim 56 distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 42.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or to credit any overpayment to account no. 501519.

Respectfully submitted,



(Reg. #27,841)

Brett A. Valiquet  
Schiff Hardin LLP  
Patent Department-Suite 6600  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312-258-5786  
Attorneys for Applicants  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26574**

CH2\7898408.1